

REMARKS

The examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show "other ground parts as described in the specification." This objection is not understood since at page 8, lines 19-28, especially lines 24-26, it is stated:

It is desirable that the antenna ground part 220a be positioned adjacent to a region on the display direction side of the display surface of the display portion 120 (i.e., on the radio wave resonance part 210a side) and on the display surface 120 side of the radio wave resonance part 210a, as shown in Figure 2(a), thereby enabling the antenna ground part 220a to prevent the radio wave resonance part 210a from being influenced by signal conductors, a ground part, etc., in the display portion 120.

The connection part 230a fixes the antenna ground part 220a so that the antenna ground part 220a is positioned closer to the connection part 230a than ground parts of the information processor 100 other than the antenna ground part 220a, e.g., the display portion 120. By fixing the antenna ground part 220a in this manner, the connection part 230a can prevent the characteristics of the antenna unit 200a from being influenced by another ground part etc., of the information processor 100.

It will be noted that the display portion 120 is shown at least in Figures 1, 2a, 2c and 3c which is identified as the "other ground part". If the examiner persists in this objection, clarification is requested.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the US patent to Usui et al, No. 6,646,607, hereinafter Usui et al. This rejection is not thought to be well taken. The examiner takes the position the Usui et al teach that the "antenna ground part is closer to the wave resonance part than other ground parts [54, 64]...."

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 12 have been amended to make explicit, what was implicit, that the other ground parts are *not* antenna ground parts as pointed out above. Hence, this position is not understood since parts 54 and 64 are themselves antenna ground parts in another embodiment. As stated in column 8, lines 30-31, "FIGS. 5 and 6 are a front view and a back view of another slot antenna system 50", lines 47-48, "The first slot antenna 53 has a ground portion 54 and

radio-wave resonant portion 55", and at column 9, lines 18-20, "The second slot antenna 63 has... a radio-wave resonate portion 65 extending in parallel with the ground portion 64...." Thus, both of these parts are ground portions of an antenna and, thus, they cannot be closer to the wave-resonant portion than they are themselves. Since this is an element of claim 1, it is believed that claim 1 is clearly allowable.

Prior art is anticipatory only if every element of the claimed invention is disclosed in a single item of prior art in the form literally defined in the claim. Jamesbury Corp. v. Litton Indus. Products, 756 F.2d 1556, 225 USPQ 253 (Fed. Cir. 1985); Atlas Powder Co. v. du Pont, 750 F.2d 1569, 224 USPQ 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984); American Hospital Supply v. Travenol Labs, 745 F.2d 1, 223 USPQ 577 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Thus, since a single reference does not show all of the claimed elements of claims 1, 9, 10 and 12, these claims are clearly allowable over Usui et al. Claims 2-6 are dependent, directly or indirectly, on claim 1, and claim 11 is dependent upon claim 10. Thus, they are allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, with respect to claim 4, this claim requires that the shielding conductor of the coaxial cable be connected to the opposite side of the antenna ground part from the side connected to the wave resonance part. In Usui et al, the connections are to the same side and, for this additional reason, claim 4 is believed to be allowable.

The allowable subject matter of claims 7-8 is noted with appreciation, but since they are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1, which as pointed out above is believed to be allowable, they are thought to be allowable in dependent form.

In view of the above, it is believed that each of the claims now in the application is distinguishable, one from the other and over the prior art.

Therefore, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/11/05

William N. Hogg
William N. Hogg, Reg. No. 20,156
Driggs, Lucas, Brubaker & Hogg Co., L.P.A.
CUSTOMER NO. 26675